



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/692,350	10/19/2000	Renato John Recio	AUS920000621US1	6899

7590 01/30/2004

BRACEWELL & PATTERSON LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
P.O. BOX 969
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0969

EXAMINER

SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

3

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/692,350

Applicant(s)

RECIO ET AL.

Examiner

Mohammad A Siddiqi

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Specification

35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are:

- a. Numerals in figure 5 drawings are 500 -514 but specification lacking the description of numerals 500-514.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1,9, 17,18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Toh et al. (5,987,011) (hereinafter Toh).

4. As per claims 1, 9, and 17, Toh discloses a method for efficiently merging subnets comprising the steps (fig 4, col 7, lines 17-18) of:

linking a first subnet having a first subnet (col 7, lines 16-19) manager (col 18, lines 39-47) and a first database (col 3, lines 57-60) with a second subnet (col 7, lines 16-19) having a second subnet manager (col 18, lines 39-47) and a second database (col 3, lines 57-60) to create a merged subnet (col 7, lines 16-19); and

dynamically selecting (col 8, lines 1-6) one of said first subnet manager (fig 4, col 18, lines 39-47) and said second subnet manger (fig 4, col 18, lines 39-47) as a master subnet manager (col 7, lines col 7, lines 16-36, bigger subnet must be master subnet), which controls the merged subnet (col 7, lines 16-36).

5. As per claim 18, Toh discloses first subnet manager is said master subnet manager (col 7, lines 17-36, ID's and keys are the characteristics of the node); and

first subnet manager absorbs configuration entries from said second database into said first database to create a merged database (col 7, lines 17-36, ID's and keys are the characteristics of the node, bigger must be master).

6. As per claim 19, Toh discloses first subnet manager controls and managers said system utilizing said merged database (col 17-36).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. Claims 2-8,10-16, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toh et al. (5,987,011) (hereinafter Toh) in view of Jensen et al. (6,185,612) (hereinafter Jensen).

8. AS per claims 2 and 10, Toh discloses partitioning subnet, updating the routing tables which is configurable (col 7, lines 16-36 and col 3, lines 66-67) . Toh is silent about the configuration entries including a partition key

(P-Key) and a global unique identifier (GUID), which are time-stamped with a time said configuration entries are modified by respective ones of said first and second subnet managers.

However, Jensen database comprise configuration entries including a partition key (P-Key) and a global unique identifier (GUID), which are time-stamped with a time (col 9, lines 19-26) said configuration entries are modified by respective ones of said first and second subnet managers (col 10, lines 9-18 and col 9, lines 4-16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine Toh with Jensen because it would support collaborative network computing by merging two or more subnets and also better secured route selection strategy.

9. As per claims 3 and 11, Toh discloses said first subnet manager is selected as said master subnet manager, said method further comprising the step of:

absorbing said subnet configuration entries from said database of the other subnet- manager to said database of said master subnet manager to create a merged database (col 7, lines 16-36).

10. As per claims 4, 12, and 20, Toh discloses merging two subnets, portioning subnets and updating the routing tables (col 7, lines 17-36).

Toh is silent about the step by process of authentication:

determining that a first GUID entry of said second database is the same as a second GUID entry of said first database; and
in response to said determining step, selecting a latest time-stamped GUID entry from among said first GUID entry and said second GUID entry as a representative GUID entry for said merged database.

However, Jensen discloses determining that a first GUID entry of said second database is the same as a second GUID entry of said first database; and in response to said determining step, selecting a latest time-stamped GUID entry from among said first GUID entry and said second GUID entry as a representative GUID entry for said merged database (col 10, lines 9-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine Toh with Jensen because it would support collaborative network computing by merging two or more subnets and also better and secure route selection strategy.

11. As per claims 5 and 13, Toh discloses the step of discarding a GUID entry not selected as said representative GUID entry (col 16, lines 53-58).

12. As per claims 6 and 14, Toh discloses determining that a first P-Key entry of a GUID of said second database of said other subnet manager is the same as a second P_key entry of a different GUID of said first database (col 8, lines 1-50); in response to said determining step, changing all occurrences of said P_Key in said second database to a new P-Key value (fig 9A and 9B, col 7, lines 17-36).

13. As per claims 7 and 15, Toh discloses changing step further comprises the step of selecting only a p-Key value that is not one of said P_Key values within said first database and said second database (col 7, lines 17-36, updating associativity tables must includes selecting data fields and finding out what have changed and commit the modified fields in the database).

14. As per claims 8 and 16, Toh discloses of configuring (col 6, lines 48-60) said merged subnet utilizing said master subnet manager (col 7, lines 17-36).

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S. Patent 6,343,320 to Fairchild et al.

U.S. Patent 6,480,506 to Gubbi et al.

U.S. Patent 6,345,294 to O'Toole et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A Siddiqi whose telephone number is (703) 305-0353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 306-5404.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

MAS



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100